

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>RORY M. WALSH,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:05-CV-0818</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 18th day of September, 2006, upon consideration of *pro se* plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 123) of the orders of court dated August 29, August 31, and September 5, 2006 (Docs. 116, 117, 120, 121),<sup>1</sup> in which the court denied plaintiff's motions to appoint counsel, stay proceedings pending appeal, deem admitted requests for admissions,<sup>2</sup> and compel production of documents, and it appearing that the instant motion, in part, merely repeats arguments from plaintiff's initial motions (compare, e.g., Doc. 124 ¶ 2, with Doc. 107 ¶ 4), see Waye v. First Citizen's Nat'l Bank, 846 F. Supp. 310, 314 (M.D. Pa. 1994) ("A motion for reconsideration is not to be used as a means to reargue matters already argued and disposed of."), and the court finding that there are no manifest

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff also objects to the memorandum dated August 31, 2006 (Doc. 117), which explains the court's denial of plaintiff's motion to stay proceedings.

<sup>2</sup> The court granted in part plaintiff's motion to deem admitted the requests for admission by requiring defendant General James L. Jones, Jr. to file with the court and send to plaintiff a verification of his responses to plaintiff's requests for admission. (See Doc. 121 ¶ 1.)

errors of law or fact in the orders and memorandum, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) (“The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence . . .”), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration (Doc. 123) is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge